



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/748,994

12/27/2000

Douglas B. Quine

F-240

6431

919

7590

06/30/2006

PITNEY BOWES INC.

35 WATERVIEW DRIVE

P.O. BOX 3000

MSC 26-22

SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER

GIBBS, HEATHER D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/748,994	Applicant(s) QUINE, DOUGLAS B.	
	Examiner Heather D. Gibbs	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7 and 10-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7 and 12-17,20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10,11,18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on April 17, 2006 has been entered and made of record. Claims 1,5,6-7,10-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the cited references do not teach or suggest, " processing said input data, at said first communication device, to computer an encrypted checksum of the entire input data." Upon further consideration, the examiner respectfully disagrees and finds that both limitations can be taught in Adler (US 6,256,115) Col 5 - Col 6 Line 16 and Col 18 Lines 14-59. Adler discloses fax transmissions being received at a first facsimile communication and then being implemented with packet checksums.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,5,7,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler *et al* (US 6,256,115) in view of Fischer (US 5,214,702).

Considering claim 1, which is representative of claim 15, Adler discloses a method of authenticating a facsimile document communicated between a first facsimile communication device and a second facsimile communication device via a

communication network (abstract; Fig 1 node 10, Col 4 lines 57-Col 6 Line 42),
comprising the steps of:

a) Receiving input data representing the entire facsimile document and
generating facsimile information in a first format by said first communication device from
said input data (Col 6 Line 17-Col 7 Line 15);

b. Processing said input data to compute an encrypted checksum of the entire
input data (abstract; Col 5 Line 66-Col 6 Lines 16; Col 18 Lines 14-59);

c. Convolving said facsimile information with said encrypted checksum data to
produce convolved data (Col 18 Line 42-col 19 line 24).

Adler does not disclose expressly decrypting, at said second communication
device, said encrypted checksum, computing a checksum of said input data received at
said second communications device, and alerting a recipient at said second
communication device in the event of a mismatch between said checksum data
computed in step (e) and said decrypted checksum data in step (d).

Fischer discloses the steps of

d. Decrypting, at said second communication device, said encrypted checksum
(Col 10 Lines 25-65; Col 16 Lines 3-27);

e. Computing a checksum of said input data received at said second
communications device (Col 16 Lines 13-43); and

f. Alerting a recipient at said second communication device in the event of a
mismatch between said checksum data computed in step (e) and said decrypted
checksum data in step (d) (Col 16 Lines 28-51).

Adler & Fischer are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit encrypted data to a destination, where it is decrypted.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Fischer with the system of Adler.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Adler's system would have better security with the inclusion of Fischer's teachings, as the destination device can decipher the transmitted message and verify the integrity of the message, thus reducing the chance of corruption, as recognized by Fischer in Col 7 Lines 26-55.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Fischer with system of Adler to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 5, which is representative of claim 16, Adler teaches wherein a database system is communicatively coupled to said second facsimile communication device (Col 9 Line 46-Col 10 Line 45).

Regarding claim 7, which is representative of claim 17, Adler comprises the step of configuring an e-mail system for receiving and displaying an alert message to said recipient along with said received input data (Col 18 Lines 14-59).

5. Claims 12-13, which is representative of claims 20-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler and Fischer in view of Bloomfield (US 6,023,345).

Adler and Fischer disclose the method as discussed above.

Adler and Fischer do not disclose expressly wherein the convolved data is transmitted to the second facsimile communication device as an e-mail attachment or sending the convolved data to a third facsimile communication device.

Bloomfield discloses wherein the convolved data is transmitted to the second facsimile communication device as an e-mail attachment or sending the convolved data to a third facsimile communication device (Col 2 Lines 9-28 and Fig 1).

Adler, Fischer & Bloomfield are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bloomfield with Adler and Fischer.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to send data via email and to a third communication device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Adler and Fischer with Bloomfield to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12-13.

6. Claim 14, which is representative of claim 22, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler and Fischer in view of Otsuka (US 5,579,126).

Adler and Fischer disclose the method as discussed above.

Adler and Fischer do not disclose expressly receiving a user name and password from a user with the second facsimile communication device.

Otsuka discloses receiving a user name and password from a user with the second facsimile communication device (Fig 9).

Adler, Fischer & Otsuka are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Otsuka with Adler and Fischer.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to receive a username and password for secure reasons.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Otsuka with Adler and Fischer to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10-11,18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 10-11,18-19 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior art which teaches the step of alerting the recipient at said second facsimile communication device in the event of a mismatch includes printing a clear mark across a print out of the received input data indication a tamper condition.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather D. Gibbs whose telephone number is 571-272-7404. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu 8AM-7PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Heather D Gibbs
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

hdg



~~Thomas D. Lee~~
PRIMARY EXAMINER